

53
518. e4.
3

THE
MANAGERS

Pro and Con :

OR, AN

ACCOUNT

Of what is said at

Child's and Tom's Coffee-Houses

For and Against

Dr. *SACHEVERELL.*

*Per Graijum populos, mediaque per Elidis urbem
Ibat ovals, divumque sibi poscebat honores.*

The Second Edition Corrected.

By J. M. Saint-Leger

LONDON:

Printed, and are to be Sold by *A. Baldwin*
in *Warwick-Lane.* 1710.

Price Six Pence.

THE
MANAGERS

OF THE

ACCOUNT

OF THE

OF THE

DEBENTURES

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

Printed and sold by J. H. ...
...
...

THE MANAGERS PRO and CON.

WHEN I saw Doctor Sacheverell, that Triumphant Criminal, pass by my Door in a Flaming and Open Chariot, now and then stopping, and then marching slowly in State to Westminster-hall, Impeach'd by the Commons of Great Britain, for a Wicked, Malicious and Seditious Intention to undermine and subvert Her Majesty's Government, and the Protestant Succession as by Law established; to defame Her Majesty's Administration; to asperse the Memory of his late Majesty; to traduce and condemn the late Happy Revolution; to contradict and Arraign the Resolutions of both Houses of Parliament; to excite Jealousies and Divisions amongst Her Majesty's Subjects; and to incite 'em to Sedition and Rebellion. Which in my humble Opinion, amounts to somewhat more than High Crimes and Misdemeanors. I cou'd not but think it an unparalleld Presumption in the Prisoner, to go so Rebelliously attended, when, as a Publick Enemy to his Church and Country, he ought to have been drawn upon a Sledge.

The Doctor appear'd to me to be Gay and Insolent; which made me Serious: The Occasion and Subject was the same, but by us differently consider'd. I, who can never forget our Deliverer; He, who will never forgive him: I, who am so pleased and easy under Her Majesty's Administration; He, who is so restless and discontented:

I, who am so Sollicitous to confirm the *Hannover* Succession; He, who is so active to defeat it. Yet I cou'd not but be of Opinion with him, that He was going to the *Hall* to make good upon the *Commons* the *Accusation of Treason and Rebellion*, upon which he had lately *Arraign'd* 'em in *St. Paul's Church*. To Him, and to Me, He, and his Council, seem'd to be the *Managers* for the Pretender; and the *Commons Managers*, seem'd only to be of Council for the *Queen and the Nation*: He and I thought, that whilst they pretended to Prosecute him, they only pleaded *their own Cause*; and if he had been acquitted of High Crimes and Misdemeanors, they must have been convicted of Rebellion and Perjury. This we both thought was the True State of the Case, which so differently affected us.

The Lords our Judges have agreed, That the *Commons* have made good the several Articles of Impeachment, and notwithstanding the Doctor solemnly forswore it, have found him guilty of the *Criminal Intention*; but yet such is their Humanity, such their undeserv'd Mercy, that if compar'd with the unexampled Cruelties, and un-presidential Punishments inflicted formerly by *Laud*, and the *High-Church-Party* in the *Star-Chamber*, the World must own, that their Chastisements are next to Impunity; the Crime only censur'd, the Criminal dismiss'd; and must confess too, that there is something more than *Cant*, in that Divine and *Royal Word*, *Moderation*.

Since the Doctor has publish'd his colourable Defence, by way of *Seditious Appeal* to the People, and 'tis impossible so soon to Print off the excellent Arguments of the *Managers* for the *Commons*, I wish some better Pen, who had heard 'em, wou'd have undertaken to have wiped out the Impression, that the Doctor's evasive and prevaricating Speech has made upon some People, whose Passions of every kind are much easier moved, than their Judgments rightly inform'd; which is my Excuse for this Paper.

ARTICLE I.

THE Doctor in his Speech is pleased to affirm, that the *Managers of the Commons* have supported their Charge

Charge by Intendments, unnecessary Implications, and strain'd Constructions; by piecing broken Sentences, conjoining distant and independent Passages, in order to make him speak what he never thought of. Speech, p. 5.

The Managers methinks were very patient to hear this Language, and very indulgent to acquiesce in his Printing it, before their Arguments were published, that the World might judge whether they were the artful Knaves, which, in my Opinion, the Doctor has here represented 'em, by applying to them the True Character of the King's Council in a former Reign: But I hope, that even the Managers at Tom's, Coffee-house are able to vindicate the Managers of the Commons from this Aspersion, till they have an Opportunity to do it much better themselves. The Managers at Tom's to support the first Article, read Forty four continued Lines of the Sermon, out of which intirely they maintain their Charge. And is this to piece broken Sentences, and to conjoin distant and independent Passages? The Managers begin with the 11th Page. The grand Security of our Government, and the very Pillar upon which it stands, is founded upon the steady Belief of the Subjects Obligation to an absolute and unconditional Obedience to the supream Power, in all Things Lawful; and the utter Illegality of Resistance upon any pretence whatsoever. Here the Managers go on verbatim, till they come to these Words, Our Adversaries think they have us sure and unanswerable on this Point, when they urge the Revolution of this Day in their Defence. But certainly they are the greatest Enemies of that, and his late Majesty, and the most ungrateful for the Deliverance, who endeavour to cast such black and odious Colours upon both: How often must they be told, that the King himself solemnly disclaim'd the least Imputation of Resistance, and the Parliament declared, that they set the Crown on his Head, upon no other Title but that of the Vacancy of the Throne.

Sermon at St. Paul's, 2 Edit. p. 11, 12.

Upon this the Managers at Tom's charge you with suggesting and maintaining, That the necessary Means used to bring about the late Happy Revolution, were odious and unjustifiable. The Managers affirm and prove, that there was Resistance at the Revolution, and that the Resistance then made, was the necessary means to bring about the Revolution.

Revolution. You say in your Sermon, and confirm it in your Answer and Speech, That *all Resistance upon any Pretence whatsoever, is utterly Illegal*. Do the Managers then make an unnecessary *Implication*; when they infer, that if Resistance be *utterly illegal*, that it is odious and unjustifiable? When you say that it is not justifiable in *any case whatsoever*, is it a *strained Construction* to make you say that it is unjustifiable in the Case of the Revolution? And when you say that it is odious and unjustifiable, is it not a fair Collection, to say that you *have cast odious and black Colours upon it*.

The Managers at Child's answer this, and say, that tho' Resistance should have been made, and tho' it were justifiable, yet the *Resistance was not the necessary Means*, nor did it bring about the *Revolution*, but that the *Abdication was the Cause of the Revolution*, and the *Resistance was only the Causa sine qua non*.

This Learned Distinction has struck deep into the Noddles of those who are lately come from the *University*, and many, who have lived too long in it. But I must ask 'em, Whether the *Resistance was the Cause of the Abdication*, or the *Abdication was the Cause of the Resistance*? If they think fit to allow that the *Resistance was the Cause of the Abdication*, then the *Resistance must be the causa efficiens*, and the necessary Means; and the *Abdication only the causa sine qua non*. Nor was the *Abdication*, (which was but one Instance of the late King's Male-administration among many others enumerated in the *Act of Rights. Primo Gul. & Mar.*) the sole Cause of the Vacancy of the Throne.

Here I must take notice of a *General Plea* that some of your *Managers* have put in for you, which goes to the whole, that *Whereas your Sermons being only a Bundle of inconsistent Nonsense, they know no Law in Being, by which a Fool is punishable, and that the Consequences wou'd extend to too many, if a President shou'd be made, to correct any Body for Preaching and Speaking foolishly*. I know that this pinches close a Person of your Pride and Self-sufficiency, to have such an Aspersions cast upon your Parts; and do really believe that you wou'd rather plead Guilty, than own your self to be an *Insignificant*, and to oblige you I'll take upon me the *Defence* of your *Understanding*, and shew that you had a *Meaning*, and a *malicious* one, which, (as

it happens commonly to Men of your Capacity) is always uppermost, for if you were so weak as to mean nothing at all, you were certainly a very insignificant Tool of the Party.

The first Article against your Understanding is grounded upon this Position of yours, *That an absolute and unconditional Obedience is due to the Supreme Power, in all things Lawful; and that Resistance is utterly illegal upon any Pretence whatsoever.* Here, they say, you are perfectly Absurd, and contradictory to your self, by tacking a Condition to your unconditional Obedience, and thereby you assert nothing, and are very clear of any Suspicion of a Meaning in this place. But in this Point, Doctor, I own you are extremely wrong'd, for I think that you write as good Sense upon the Subject as most of the Fathers either living or dead, and you seem to think so too; and impatient of this Calumny, you point out your Finger in the Margin of your Collections, to a certain Bishop, as if you desired him, in his own and your Justification to say, whether the Distinction of *Active Obedience* in all things lawful, and *Passive Obedience* in all things possible, won't make your Doctrine Orthodox, and your Sense unquestionable.

But your Managers at Child's, who have a better Opinion of your Understanding, say, that your Art was Nice, and your Caution Remarkable, to leave the *Supreme Power* indefinite, and at large, to fix it where you please upon Occasion; and that, if by any other Passages of your Sermon, it shou'd be demonstrated, that by the *Supreme Power* you mean the Prince, yet still you are at Liberty to explain that *unconditional Obedience*, as due to his executive Power. That you laid down the Doctrine of *Non-Resistance* only as a general Rule, to which you allowed Exceptions, and that undoubtedly *Non-Resistance* was a good and wholesome Doctrine, and proper to be preach'd with a Mental Reservation: That Necessity made Resistance Lawful. And they say, that your Council insisted much upon this as your best Defence. But your Managers differ amongst themselves in this Point, and those who asperse your Understanding, say, that you were stark Mad to depart from the Defence of your Council; and to avow in your Speech, that you preach'd that Doctrine in the full Latitude that the Fathers Dead and Living taught it, because those Fathers, who are the Principal Teachers of un-

conditional Obedience, (as Bishop *Sanderson*) do most undeniably in exprefs Words exclude *all Exceptions* to their *general Rule*, and 'tis evident that they lodge the *Supream Power* in the Prince, that they make no *Distinction* of the *executive Power*. This *Justification*, they say, untwists all that your Council said in your Defence, and from hence it follows, that the *Case* of the *Revolution* cou'd not be, even *Mentally* excepted out of your *general Rule*, and I hope that I shall satisfy most People, that your Design was exprefly to condemn it.

The Doctor says, Page 11. *That our Adversaries think they effectually stop our Mouths, and have us sure and answerable on this Point, when they urge the Revolution of this Day in their Defence; but certainly they are the greatest Enemies of that, and his late Majesty, and the most ungrateful for the Deliverance, who endeavour to cast such black and odious Colours upon both. How often must they be told, that the King himself solemnly disclaim'd the least Imputation of Resistance in his Declaration, and that the Parliament declared, that they set the Crown on his Head, upon no other Title but that of the Vacancy of the Throne, &c. And then a little further he says, Thus do they endeavour to draw Comparisons, and to justify the Horrid Actions and Principles of Forty One.*

The Doctor having laid down the general Rule of Non-Resistance, now undertakes to defend the Generality of it, and being aware that the late Revolution wou'd be objected against it, and least his *Adversaries* (*viz.* the Friends to the *Revolution*) shou'd offer the Resistance of that Day, as an Exception to his general Rule, he answers 'em before hand, that there was no Resistance at that time, that the King himself has denied the least Resistance, and that they who endeavour to prove there was any Resistance, cast odious and black Colours upon his Majesty, and the Deliverance.

To what purpose was the Case of the Revolution mentioned just after the Doctor's general Rule of the Illegality of Resistance? It must be, either to except it out, or condemn it by that general Rule. If then he excepts it out of the Rule, it is because there was no Resistance made; But if it happens that there was Resistance at the Revolution, the Doctor has cast *odious* and *black Colours* upon both the *Deliverer* and *Deliverance*. And to blacken

'em yet more, he says, that *thus* (i. e. by maintaining that Resistance) *they* (i. e. *his Adversaries* who defend the Revolution) *justify the Actions and Principles of Forty One* by a Comparison drawn between 'em. By which it's plain that the Doctor makes the Revolution as scandalous as the Transactions about *Forty One*, if founded on Resistance.

The Doctor persists to the last in his Speech, p. 7. That there was no Resistance made at the Revolution; What will not this Man dare to affirm or deny? Did not the Bishop of *London* himself re-assume the Sword? And had he not the Honour to have the Princess *ANNE* under his Guard? Did he not display his Colours with that remarkable *Motto*, that succinctly comprehended the reason of the general Resistance, *viz. quia nolumus mutare leges Angliæ*? Did not Archbishop *Sancroft* take up Offensive and Defensive Arms, when he forc'd the *Tower* from the King's Governor? But tell me, Doctor, how cou'd you affirm to the Queen's Face, that there was no Resistance? When you knew that Her Majesty her self was in Arms, and acted so great a part in the *Glorious Revolution*, and that many Hundreds of your Audience had been in *Arms*. How many Lords have since boasted of the Resistance they then made, notwithstanding you were capable of asserting the contrary to their Faces?

I am not surprized to see the Prince of *Orange's* Declaration wrested by the Doctor, who is as free with the Scriptures; the Prince never disclaim'd Resistance, but the Title of Conquest: But *Sacheverell* either understands nothing, or is resolved to pervert every thing.

It appears by the Letter left by King *James*, That he himself apprehended that he was resisted, when he complains of an Order sent him at Midnight, to remove next Morning from his Palace, and that the Prince of *Orange's* Guards had taken Possession of the Posts about Whitehall, without I.

his being advertis'd of it; afterwards he says, *He was born free, and desires to continue so; therefore he thinks it not convenient to expose himself to be secured, and not to be at Liberty.* 'Tis plain by this Letter, that the King apprehended, that when he was ordered to go to *Ham*, that he was made a Prisoner, or at least that he was likely to be made one soon; and to imprison the King, is as high Resistance as can be made. Therefore as many

Gentlemen as believe, there was actual Force, and Resistance made at the Revolution, must say that *Sacheverell* has cast odious and black Colours (which I hope won't stick) upon the Revolution; and that he is the greatest Enemy of that, and his late Majesty, and the most ungrateful for the Deliverance.

The Doctor defends the Doctrine of Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance, as taught by the Sermons or *Homilies* put out in *Edward* the Sixth's Time, and says, That those Homilies were Establish'd by the Thirty Nine Articles, and that those Thirty Nine Articles were Confirm'd by the Thirteenth of Elizabeth, and that they are now made Perpetual and Fundamental by the Act of Union.

The Managers against the Doctor attack the very Foundation of the Doctor's Defence, and if the Reader adjudges the Argument to be good, it's a full Answer to all the Speeches that have been made for him; they say, that the Article, which contains the Homilies; and a great many more of the *Nine* and *Thirty Articles*, were not confirm'd by the Thirteenth of Elizabeth, nor any other Act of Parliament; and consequently, the Doctrine of Non-Resistance is not deposited in such a Place of Security as in the irrevocable Act of Union.

The Statute of the Thirteenth of Elizabeth confirms all the Articles of Religion, which ONLY concern the Confession of the true Christian Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacrament, but neither that Article about the Homilies, nor several other Articles which ONLY concern Matters of Discipline, were ever confirm'd by Parliament to this Day. I refer the Reader to the Argument at large annexed to this Paper, which I don't doubt, but will convince him of the Truth of this Assertion.

We must then consider the *Homilies* as so many Sermons wrote by the Clergy in *Edward* the Sixth's Time, when few of them were of tolerable Learning or Abilities: Does it appear that they had our Constitution under Consideration? Does it not appear that they understood nothing of it? The Resistance that was made against *Richard* the Third, was then fresh in their Memory; who, bad as he was, even such an Anointed was not to be touched by their Rules, if stretch'd to an unlimited Sense. They might have heard of many Precedents of deposing our former Tyrants, and easily collected that it was the Practice of the Church

Church, and Law of *England* in such unfortunate Cases; let us consider their Argument thus.

A *Convocation* of the Clergy confirm a Doctrine, utterly inconsistent with the Constitution of the State, and therefore 'tis an high Presumption in the Laity against the Authority of the Church, to refuse to be bound down by it. Some modern Doctors misapply, and misconstrue those Doctrines, and then it is Irreligion and Atheism to examine or enquire into their Mistakes. May we not be permitted to oppose the Sentiments and Practices of those *Convocations*, against the Opinions and Comments of the Expositors of their Doctrine? It's very probable that the Members of those Convocations best understood their own Meanings, and surely they would never have assisted so freely and largely in resisting the *French* and *Spanish* Tyrants, and defended their oppress'd Subjects, if they had ever thought that Resistance was *de toto genere*, unlawful, and that a Tyrant was upon no Pretence to be resisted. And I think it a fatal Stroke to the Kingdom, if the *Sevennois* were denied Assistance thro' this Modern Principle. Whose Support was both lawful, and of infinite Advantage to the Allies.

To support that unsupportable Sense of the Homilies, the Doctor produces the concurrent Opinions of many Learned Fathers, down from the Reformation to this Day, who have preach'd the same Doctrine, and thinks his Case *extream hard that he should be accused for what others have receiv'd Thanks*; he might very truly have added, and been made Bishops for it, and then he would have explain'd the Reason why they preach'd it, and what he himself expected for having done it.

It is allowed by all sides that the *Manmarins* and *Sibthorps* were the first Authors of King *Charles's* Misfortunes, by misguiding his *Conscience* in the very same Point, in effect, that you endeavour to deceive the Queen: It was some as wicked as you who perswaded her Father, that the Church of *England* wou'd not, nay, cou'd not, resist; and you think it your *singular Misfortune* that for this fatal Doctrine you have not received Thanks, or Preferment from Her Majesty.

Notwithstanding that some Fathers have strain'd such Homilies as regard this Point, which was always the high way to Preferment, yet they have rejected others; which

is a strong Argument to me, that that Article which contains the Homilies was never confirm'd by Parliament, and that the Clergy thought themselves at Liberty to amend, alter, or reject, wholly, or in part, any Article that did not concern the Confession of the True Christian Faith, or Doctrine of the Sacraments; and therefore the Homily about the Idolatry of Pictures and Organs, is now exploded as erroneous, and the use of them now allowed; which cou'd not have been done by the Clergy alone, if that Article about the Homilies had been confirm'd by the 13th of Elizabeth, as it is pretended.

The Doctor's Managers insist, that their Doctrine of Non-Resistance is warranted by Law, and to prove this they read a Clause in the Militia Act of the 13th of Charles the II. viz. *That both, or either of the Houses of Parliament, may not lawfully raise, or levy War, Offensive or Defensive, against his Majesty;* and the same Parliament in the next Sessions fram'd a Position in the Corporation Act in the same Sense, and almost in the same Words, viz. *That it is not lawful, upon any Pretence whatsoever, to take Arms against the King,* and obliged People to Swear to this Declaration. The Oath in the Corporation Act, and the Clause in the Militia Act, being convertible Positions, both only declaring the Illegality of resisting the King, if the Clause were made the Oath, or the Oath turn'd into the Clause, it wou'd make no difference: Since therefore the Corporation Oath stands repealed by the 1st of W. and M. the Militia Clause being one and the same thing with the Oath, is not only virtually, but expressly repealed too; and those Acts being made upon the Restoration, only to condemn the Antimonarchical Principles, and to settle the Power of the Militia in the King, it wou'd astonish the Makers, who design'd only to preserve one part of the Constitution, viz. *The Monarchy,* to see that very Act stretch'd to the Subversion of the whole.

They who are not satisfy'd with this, may observe, that by the several Acts mention'd in the Preamble of the Impeachment, the very Substance and Intention (if it had any such Intention) of the Militia Act is damn'd, and the Arms of Resistance avowed to have been justifiable and necessary; and to confirm the Legality of Resistance in some Cases, the Act of Rights and Liberties, 1st G. & M. Sect. 9. says, *That upon such and such Misdemeanors of the King*
and

and Queen, that the Subjects shall thereby be *absolved* from their *Allegiance*, which Act will and ought to protect them against the Statute of Treasons of E. III. if they in such Cases do Resist: And this Act will justify, that there is an *indispensible Duty of Resistance* in some Cases, and that they are *Traitors to Posterity*, who refuse to perform the Trust repos'd in 'em by this Act; that to *encourage* them to Resist, has *absolved* them from their *Allegiance*; that to *protect* 'em in *Resistance*, has granted 'em an *Indemnity*.

But since some Learned Gentlemen would prove the Law *felo de se*, and make a Clause of one Act, to destroy both Law and Parliament; since some ridicule the *Original Contract*, by importunately desiring to see it, I hope I shall be able here to give a good Account of it, and to shew the *Original Right* of the *People* to defend themselves against a King becoming a Tyrant.

I suppose no body expects to see an *Original Contract* in Writing, Time must needs have worn out that, and 'tis likely 'twas only verbal; and we must be satisfy'd with the best Evidence a Matter of that Nature is capable of: If the first Records of Authority mention the *Conditional Tenure* of the Crown, and the Duties impos'd on the King by the People; if our former Kings have confirm'd this in Parliament; if the Opinions of all the Antient Lawyers agree, that the People had an *Original Right* to what was so confirm'd; if the People have ever since enjoy'd and maintain'd that Right, sure there's something more than *Fable* in this *Original Compact*.

In the *Saxon* Parliaments, few new Laws were enacted: but the Custom then was, for some of the most Learned Members to declare upon Oath the Fundamental Laws of the Realm to the King and the People. I find in *Edward* the Confessor's time, twelve Sworn Sages pronounced the Law, thus: *Rex, ad hoc est constitutus; ut Regnum & Ecclesiam ab injurijs defendat, quod nisi fecerit, nec nomen regis in eo constabit, verum nomen Regis perdit, debet Justitia magis regnare quam voluntas Prava*; and further, *Rex eris dum bene regis, quod nisi feceris, nomen Regis perdis*. Lambard 142. I observ'd here, that first the excellent Duties of the King are enumerated, and the Purposes specify'd for which he was made: That in the beginning there was a Limitation set upon his Power, that

that he should Rule by the Law, and not by wicked Will or Arbitrary Power: That the Original Conditions were expressed, for the breach of which he was to be Unking'd. Which strongly makes out an Original Contract.

If it be observ'd here, that it is not expressly said, that the King was constituted by the *People*, nor that the *People* are to depose him upon failure of his Duty: Yet it must be allow'd, that there were Conditions annexed to the Crown, and that it was forfeitable for the Breach of them; and when we find who had a Right to punish delinquent Kings, we shall discover between whom the Original Contract was made.

The Conquest has made no alteration in our Fundamental Laws; for even the Conqueror submitted to wear the Crown upon the Conditions that his *Saxon* Predecessors had enjoy'd it. After this, the first memorable Assertion of the People's Right by the Original Contract, was in King *John's* time, which at last ended in a full Recognition of the People's Right to dethrone Tyrannizing Kings. I'll only repeat part of the substance of a Clause in the Act of Parliament, drawn in the form of a Charter, and refer the Examination of it to the whole Clause in the Appendix:

Charter of K. John, dated at Running Mead.

If the King, or his Justices in his Absence, do not reform Miscarriages within Forty Days after they are complain'd of, the Five and Twenty Barons, and all the Commonalty of England may distress us by all the ways they can, till it be amended, and the Subjects may Swear to Obey the said Barons, and to distress us.

I know of no Objection to be made against this Charter, but what may be made against the Great Charter; and Historians say, they are the very same, which may be the reason why this is omitted out of the Statute-Book. The Lawyers of those times concur, that the People insisted only upon their Ancient Liberties; the Confessor's Laws say, the Tyrant shall be Unking'd. This Charter declares who shall have Power to Unking him. The Method only was then settled of making use of the Coercive Power of the People, which was before their Original Right.

Bracton, Lib. 2. C. 16. Fleta, Lib. 1. C. 17. express themselves, That the Law is above the King; that the High Court

Court (of Parliament) is superior to the King; that the King is made by the Law: And therefore if the King be without a Bridle, that is, without Law, they must Bridle him. These Opinions justify, that the People had a Right to Bridle King John, a most unruly Prince, and that King John granted 'em nothing but what was their due. If these Authors are not often quoted in the *Hall*, it is because they are not *Case-reporters*; but consider'd as Historical Collectors of the Old Law, they are certainly in this Case the best Evidence. Some Gentlemen may perhaps object, that these Laws are too old to be of Force, as they say, that some Precedents are too *Modern* to be good. But the Opinion of Chancellor *Fortescu* is Antient enough to be venerable, and Modern enough to be credited.

The Chancellor in the 9th Chapter tells the Prince of Wales, That England is a Political Kingdom, and that the King governs by a Political Power; therefore he can't alter the Laws of the Kingdom. C. 13. He tells the Prince, how a Political Kingdom is to be made; *A People that raise themselves into a Kingdom, must ever appoint one to be the chief Ruler of the whole Body, which in Kingdoms is called King.* Then he informs the Prince of the Original of this Political Kingdom of England, viz. That it was form'd from Brutus and his Companions. Then he informs by whom, and to what end this Political Kingdom was form'd, viz. *The King was made and ordain'd for the Defence of the Law of his Subjects, and of their Bodies and Goods, whereunto he receiveth Power from his PEOPLE; so that he cannot govern his PEOPLE by any other Power.* 'Tis plain, that Fortescu thought the King deriv'd his Power from the People; and I much rely upon his Opinion, as being the most Learned and best of our Chancellors, except the Present. He liv'd at a time when the Title of the Crown was most canvass'd, and best understood: He wrote for the Instruction of the *Heir Apparent*, was too great a Lawyer to mistake the Fundamentals of our Constitution, and too faithful a Councillor to misguide the Judgment of the Young Prince.

Wherefore, since it appears by the most ancient Monuments of the Constitution, that Limitations and Conditions were originally impos'd upon the King, and that the King upon his Demerits was removeable, which necessarily

cessarily implies an *Original Contract*, since Chancellor *Fortescu* affirms, That the King of *England* was made King by, and receiv'd his Power from, the People, since by the *Magna Charta* of King *John*, the Right and Power of Dethroning Kings for Breach of the Contract, has been acknowledg'd and settled in the People: *The Original Contract* must needs have been between the King and the People, who gave the King Power to Govern, and reserved a Right to themselves to remove him for Tyranny; which Power and Right, have been enjoy'd by the People from the Original of Government in *England* down to this Day, as often as the *Necessity* of the Case compell'd them to make use of it.

But since some are endeavouring the Ruin of the State, by an upstart Doctrine of the Church, it is with great Pleasure I have read the History of the *Church Resistant, Protestant Catholick*, as well as *Roman Catholick*, and it is exceeding comfortable to me, who, with regard to my Duty towards God, think it a heinous Sin to Rebel against the Lawful Powers of a good Prince; and yet with respect to my Country, think my self indispensibly obliged to resist the unlawful Acts of a Tyrant: to find, that this Doctrine of Non-Resistance, (as now preached) is not the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, nor the true Sense of the Homilies, that the Practice and Opinions of all the subsequent Convocations have been contrary; to find, that the true meaning of *Kings having their Power from God*, is not, that they have any distinct Authority besides the Law of the Land derived to them from God, but that by the Laws of God, the Authority of the Law of the Land, was secured to them: That the Laws of Religion in the Scripture, did only Establish the several Constitutions and Governments that were in the different Parts of the World. To find all this so well proved, in the incomparable Speech of the Bishop of *Salisbury*, and by the Opinions of the greatest part of the *Sacred Bench*, to find the Truth force it self out of the Mouths of the *Prisoner's Council*; who did all fully and plainly own, that in Cases of extream Necessity, an exception of the Doctrine was to be admitted, and that such was the Case of the *Revolution*; to find the *Revolution* justify'd, by those who were brought there to arraign it, gives entire Satisfaction to my Conscience, that I perform'd my Duty to my Country in resisting

sitting King James, without breaking the Law or Ordinance of God.

But you, *Doctor*, wave all Defences, but that of your Homilies: And of all their Expositors, the Opinion of Bishop *Sanderson* is properest for your Purpose, and the Spirit of it very agreeable to your Genius: I dare not be so unmannerly free with either dead or living *Prelates*, as you, you dutiful Son of the Church, nor do I believe, nor will I call Bishop *Sanderson* a false Son of the Church, or a perfidious *Prelate*, because I think him out in one Opinion; which maintains that *defensive Arms* are de toto genere unlawful, and may not be taken up by any Man, at any time, in any Case, upon any Colour, or Pretension whatsoever, not for the Defence of Religion; nor for the Preservation of a Church, or State, no, nor yet, if that could be imagin'd possible, for the Salvation of a Soul, no, not for the Redemption of the whole World.

If this Doctrine be *Orthodox*, then Christ came into the World upon a poor Errand, to be Crucified for the Redemption of Mankind; which in this Bishop's Opinion, is not of equal Consideration with the Interests of a single Man. I take this Doctrine to be so far from being Apostolical, that I make bold to affirm it to be a wild and blasphemous Rant, and very proper to be burnt with Doctor *Sacheverell's Blasphemous Collections*.

As there are many Precedents to justify Resistance in the History of the Jews, in whose Political Government God had such an immediate Hand, as to condescend to be for some time even their King: I shall only give one Instance of the Resistance that the *Maccabees* made against *Antiochus*, when he endeavour'd to make them break their Laws, by eating Swine's Flesh, and attempted to introduce Idolatry into their Temples. This, in Bishop *Sanderson's* Opinion, tho' to save their Church, and Laws, had not been sufficient Cause to resist, yet we see that God himself supported their just Cause, and by God's Assistance, they quenched the Violence of Fire, escaped the Edge of the Sword, out of Weakness were made Strong, waxed valiant in Fight, turn'd to flight the Armies of the Aliens*. Tho' St. Paul himself gives them these Encomiums, yet this Bishop would make St. Paul say in another

* Thorndike, p. 306. St. Chrysostom, Hom. 27: in Epist. ad Heb. & alli.

Place, that they, and all those who *resist in any Case whatsoever*, were to receive to themselves Damnation.

I doubt not, if St. Paul were now living, but he would applaud the *Arms* of the *English* taken up against their *Antiochus*, because, as in the Case of the *Maccabees*, Idols were brought into our Church, and our Laws broken; and because *that God, even our own, and his God, has given 'em his Blessing.*

The Managers for the Doctor bring another Argument against the Revolution, and say, that they are proud of the Part they acted in it, and yet it was Rebellion, because if they had not succeeded, they would have been all Hang'd by the Laws. Undoubtedly, if a Tyrant gets the Upper-hand of the Subjects, he'll put 'em to Death without Mercy, and we know that King James had then a set of Judges, and some Bishops, who would have declar'd it both *Law* and *Gospel*. But those who consider the Authority of the Laws before-mentioned, will say, that King James upon his *Male administration* was *ipso facto* no King, and that there could be no Rebellion against him, to whom no *Allegiance* was due.

It seems strange to me, that Gentlemen should value themselves for being *Rebels*, yet I wish that some of them may not really now think, that *they deserve to be Hang'd* for having done so much at the Revolution. And it is to be apprehended, lest thro' a constant Reflection upon their *Rebellion*, and Injustice done to the late King, they may at last, thro' a Compunction of Conscience, think of some *Restitution*; and to make some amends for the Expulsion of the Father, at last propose a *Restoration* of the supposed Son.

This leads me to reflect, who have reviv'd this Doctrine, to what end it should be now trump'd up, and universally Preach'd? How is this *Doctrine wholesome and necessary for these Times*? When our Beloved Queen Reigns in the very Souls of all her People except *Sacheverell and Company*. I must observe, that the Author of the *Latin Sermon*, not contented to instil artfully this *Poisonous Doctrine* into the Ears of most of the Congregations about Town; but projecting to spread it universally, took an Opportunity to harangue the whole Clergy of London together. The Duty of the Day was forgot, the Design of the Preacher was only to defend, and recommend this

Doctrine

Doctrine to their particular Care ; and in his *Dedication*, he gives them their *Cue*, and insinuates, that this Doctrine, by a *Common Consent*, and a *Common Concern*, is to be propagated.

Sacheverell's Part was to set right (as they cant) the young Clergy and Youth of the University. And these two Gentlemen have laboured so abundantly in their Provinces, that go to most Churches, and you'll be apt to think there's but one Text in the Bible, or that every Text speaks but one Thing.

Since this rank Weed has so overspread, and is so deep-rooted in the University, since a new set of Professors is establish'd to teach Jacobitism, since such Industry is used to breed up the young Nobility and Gentry in an Aversion to the true Principles of our Constitution ; in an Abhorrence of the late Revolution, in a general dislike of the *Hannover* Succession, since they are become downright Nurseries of Parties and Factions, since even Popery it self begins to peep Abroad, something more must be done by the Parliament than burning their Decrees ; or else a foreign Education will infallibly be the Consequence.

When was this Doctrine revived ? Since the Declension of the Power of France, and a little before the Scotch Expedition. What are the necessary Consequences to be drawn from these Doctrines, if they were once settled ? That the Revolution was founded in Iniquity, and that Injustice was done to King James, who ought not to have been resisted ; then it will follow that King William and Queen Mary were Usurpers, that our rightful and lawful Queen is an Usurper, that there is another Brood of Usurpers coming over from Hannover, and that so much Blood and Money has been spent in an unjust War. These are the odious and black Colours that these Gentlemen cast upon the Revolution and the present Government. And to what purpose they do it at this Juncture, appears plainly, since now they have lost all hopes of carrying on the Work by a French Power.

Who were most concern'd for the good Success of *Sacheverell's* Doctrine and Tryal ? The Non-jurors, Jacobites, and Papists ; who own this to be the fairest Push that ever was made for their Master ? Who were the most remarkable Managers for the Doctor ? Those who were for an Administration and Regency, and against the Coronation

of the *P. of O.* Those, who put such a sudden stop to the last War, and were so unwilling to enter into this: Those, who distress'd King *William* into the *Partition Treaty*, and afterwards thought it reasonable to hang his Ministers for it: And those to a Man, who were against the Union, and now with their usual Sincerity pretend to be the Zealous Maintainers of it. How close are all these united, and almost under Arms to defend this unknown and *worthless* Man! Hated by all who know him, for his Ingratitude and Presumption, nay, they themselves will tell you, 'tis not the *Man*, but the *Cause*, they defend. Since therefore we defend the Cause of the *Revolution*, I wish they would explain what *Cause* it is they defend.

It's remarkable, that *now* all private Quarrels are forgot, and open Enemies put Confidence in one another: No body hated *Sacheverell* more than the Chief of his own *Managers*; *Sacheverell* was never so bitter as upon a certain *false Brother*, whom he distinguish'd in his Sermon by the Name of the *Turncoat*: But for that Purpose, *Sim. Harcourt* and at that time, *Pilate* and *Herod* were made Friends, for before they were at Enmity between themselves.

Sacheverell, in his Speech, would make us believe, that 'tis impossible that he should be a Favourer of the Pretender, because he has abjur'd him. This indeed would be a good Argument in the Mouth of a Man of Probity; but since *Sacheverell* and his Managers allow of Mental Exceptions and Reservations, we must examine this Matter. It is *now* well known, that some Gentlemen formerly, who would never qualify themselves for the *Lieutenancy*, or the *Commission* of the Peace, took all the Oaths to get into the *House of Commons*, and had Dispensations for the Services which they were capable of doing there. There are now Circumstances to make us believe, that the *Jacobite* Clergy have the like Instructions to take any Oaths, to get Possession of a Pulpit for the Service of the *Cause*, to bellow out the *Hereditary Right*, the pretended Title of the Pretender. Have not the Non-jurors at this Juncture, and for this very Purpose taken the Oaths? Has not Parson *Higgins*, the most inveterate, and most impudent of the Non-jurors, just now done it; and did he not lately out-brazen *Sacheverell* himself, and no doubt but for the same Cause that *Higgins* has

has sworn *Allegiance* to Queen *ANNE*, *Sacheverell* has *abjur'd* the Right of the Pretender. We know that the one allows the *Defacto*ship of the Queen, and the other reserves to himself the *Divine Right* of the Pretender. *Sacheverell* says, that he has given *Publick Demonstrations* of his *True Zeal* for her Majesty, by defending her Title to the Crown. Which he does thus in his *Oxford Sermon*; he allows, *That by a long Succession of Her Royal Ancestors*, an *Hereditary Right* has been devolved upon Her, and says very truly, *That even her very worst Enemies will acknowledge it*, as he himself, and Mr. *Leslie*, who was the first Defender of this Title. Ask the Gentlemen at *St. Germain's* what Title their Master has to the Crown of *Great Britain*, they'll say his *Hereditary Right* devolved upon him from his *Royal Ancestors*? Ask *Sacheverell* what Right the Queen has to the Crown, he answers, Her *Hereditary Right* devolved upon her from Her *Royal Ancestors*? But if these Advocates should ever meet, they'd soon reconcile these Difficulties, and compound the Two *Hereditary Rights* into One. *Sacheverell*, *Leslie*, and the Queen's new Council *Extraordinary*, maintain Her *Hereditary Right* to the Crown, because they pretend to know that there is a nearer Heir: 'Tis for this they labour to make the Crown hang upon Her Head, only by that Slipknot of *Hereditary Right*, when it's so hard bound on by Parliament. And if that Point could be once gain'd, they are ready, no doubt, to produce their *Immediate Heir*; and thus these Councillors, a set of *False Brethren*, that the Doctor takes no notice of, whilst they pretend to be of Council for the Queen, only open and set forth the Title of Her *Adversary*. It's thus that these Defenders will allow the *Hereditary Right* of the *Hannover* Family, because they know that even the House of *Bourbon* is before them.

The King and Parliament have always had, and used a Power of settling, directing and binding the Descent of the Crown in the Royal Blood, different from the common course of other Inheritances, (it was Treason to deny this by the 13th of *Elizabeth*, which Act in substance is revived by the late Act of the Queen) who often have prefer'd the *Mediate* Heir to the *Immediate*, as lately the Queen was advanced before the Pretender, without taking notice of his Illegitimacy. The House
of

of *Hannover*, before the House of *Savoy*. When *Sacheverell* and his *Managers* talk upon this Point, they are just upon the brink of Treason, puzzled to bring it out, and labouring to with-hold it.

Mr. Hoadly, who, to his Honour, has incurr'd the Malice of the whole Party, and been recommended by their Satyr to the Parliament, and by the Parliament in a very honourable manner to the Queen, has admirably exposed the Self-Contradictions of one of them, in the Appendix to his last Book: There he brings in the *Dean*, de-

Right's and Powers of English Convocation, Ed. 1. p. 105. *Heart, and be at Hand always, to stand up with them, (viz. the Laity) and to Resist a growing Tyranny, either in Church or State.* *Mr. Hoadly* is not able to reconcile this Doctrine, with that contain'd in the *Latin Sermon*: But tho such inconsistent Principles are irreconcilable, yet if we consider the Circumstances of Time, we may account for them; because it seems to be much the same Design that made him print that Doctrine then, that has made him preach this Doctrine now. That Book was printed in 1700. then *K. W.* was upon the Throne, and the *Hannover Succession* upon the Anvil; then *Mr. Dean* was ready to resist a growing Tyranny in Church and State. The *Latin Sermon* I hear was first preach'd in *English* about 1708. then it was a damnable Sin to resist their Hereditary Right, who was about that time on board the *Mars*.

Since the Doctor complains so much of his hard Fortune to be misunderstood, and other hard Circumstances of his Impeachment, I must here enumerate some of his Felicities: First, he sent to *Oxford* for a *Testimonium* of his Loyalty and good Behaviour; they, it seems, were so much inclin'd in his Favour, as only to deny it; and so backward, as not to draw up an *Information* against him. Next, he had the Confidence to appeal to a noble Lord in his Speech, the Bishop of *Litchfield* and *Coventry*, for his Character, after which Day the Bishop charitably absented from the House, apprehending (as 'tis suppos'd) that he might be called upon, to give a Character of him, which would have been such, ('tis believed) as would have made out the Criminal Intention laid in the Impeachment. If this be not true, 'twould be much to the

Do-

Do
the
ten
tho
Dis
Exp
mor
this
to b
the
T
Fair
ciple
(wh
Defe
tary
Let
who
of th
by m
that
Let u
but f
stor
most
for th
probab

TH
9
lation
Docto
science
sworn
in his
cannot
the Do
he refle
tion, c
Quibb
Do-

Doctor's Reputation, yet to procure a Testimonial from the Bishop. Is it not a peculiar Happiness that has attended the Doctor thro' the Course of his Trial? That tho' he challenges the World to shew any *Indication of his Dislike to the Protestant Succession*, to prove any *favourable Expressions towards the Pretender*, or *Aspersions upon the Memory of the late King*. No body appeared to prove, that this *innocent Doctor* had said that King *William* deserved to be *Demitted*, and that he had curst him for his Legacy, the *Hannover Succession*.

To conclude this Article, let us consider this *Loyal and Faithful Subject*; this *Sincere Protestant*, associated in Principles with *Jacobites*, *Papists*, *Juring*, *Non-juring*, and (what's worse) *such abjuring Clergy*, let us consider this *Defender of the Queen's Title*, who waves her *Parliamentary Limitation*, to rest it only upon an *Hereditary Right*. Let us consider this *Friend to the Protestant Succession*, who ridicules the *Parliamentary Right* under the Name of the *Right of the People*, and the Title of the *Mob*, taught by *new Preachers and new Politicians*; when it's certain, that the House of *Hannover* has its Title by *Parliament*: Let us consider the Scope of the Sermon, and we cannot but say it was to condemn the *Revolution*; and if the Doctor is guilty of any of these ill Intentions, he is in a most deplorable Condition, and has now more occasion for the Prayers of the Church, as under a State of *Reprobation*, than when under an *Imaginary Persecution*.

ARTICLE II.

THE Managers against the Doctor say, that in Page 8, 9. among the several sorts of *False Brethren*, with relation to God, Religion and the Church, enumerated by the Doctor, those who defend *Toleration*, and a *Liberty of Conscience* are comprehended. The Doctor himself has not sworn off the Intention to condemn a *Toleration*, but owns in his Speech, That what he may have said offensive of that, cannot be adjudged to reflect on the *Act of Exemption*. Here the Doctor only distinguishes himself off, by saying, that he reflected only upon *A Toleration*, and not *The Toleration*, or *Legal Indulgence*, which looks to me more like a Quibble than a Distinction. He says, that he cannot be thought

thought to reflect upon the Act of Parliament, because there is no Act of *Toleration*. Does not the Doctor and his *Managers* continually tell us of the *Test Act*? And tho' there's no Act so entitl'd, yet we understand what Act they mean; as they understand us, when we talk of the *Toleration Act*, to mean that Act of the First of *William and Mary*. Is there a necessity either in Speaking or Writing, to use such a Circumlocution? as to say, (*The Act for exempting Their Majesty's Protestant Subjects, dissenting from the Church of England, from the Penalties of certain Laws*) as often as there is occasion to speak of the *Toleration*. Do not our publick Instruments run thus? Has not the Queen promis'd, that she will *inviolably maintain the Toleration*? But the Doctor takes this to be one of his *hard Fortunes*, that the Lords his Judges, should understand this Word, or any other Words, or Passages of his Sermon, in the common Sense that the rest of Mankind do. The Doctor says, there's no such thing as a *Toleration Act*, because the word *Toleration* implies more than the Law-givers design'd to grant: The Act says in Section 8. that such Persons shall be exempted from Penalties for the Exercise of Religion, Permitted and Allowed by this Act. Which seem to be more favourable Words than *Tolerated*; *Allowance*, in my humble Opinion implying *Approbation*; *Toleration* only a bare Sufferance.

Let us here examine how the Doctor treats the Dissenters, if not his *Brethren*, at least his nearest *Relations* in Christ. It wou'd be tedious to repeat all the nasty Names he bestows upon 'em, but let us observe the History that he gives of 'em in Page 20. First he pretends to give you the Original of these *Miscreants* begot in Rebellion, born in Sedition, and nursed up in Faction; then he tells you, they are grown up to be almost Christians, Seditious, and Schismatical Impostors; and then they became Wretched, Empty, Hypocritical Sophisters: Then he tells you what is to be done with them; they are to be treated like growing Mischiefs, and infectious Plagues. Then he disposes of 'em, conducts 'em to Hell, and there settles 'em. This is the Liberty of Speech that the Doctor takes, yet how barbarous was it, to call him only a *Tool of a Party*. In how Christian-like manner have these Dissenters born these Revilings? With what Resignation and Primitive Patience have they endured the late Insults and Injuries done 'em?

Sure

Sure Self-defence is lawful against Midnight Incendiaries, Plunderers, Rioters, Felons, and Rebels; yet how did these People, bred up in the Principles of Rebellion, defend themselves, but by Flight? Have these Clamorous, Church-devouring Malignants, even so much as complain'd of the Church-men, who rais'd this Mob. Have these profess'd Enemies of the Queen, undutifully remonstrated to her, that the publick Faith of the Nation has been violated, by the Indignities lately done to their Religious Worship? Have they murmured at their Losses? Or petition'd the Parliament for a Recompense? So dutiful has been their Behaviour!

The Modern *Laudeans* can scarce bear the Word *Reformation*; which their Predecessors formerly call'd a *Deformation*. But this *Toleration* will be for ever odious, because it was introduced by the late King; and Moderation will be always call'd *Cant*, because it came lately from the *Throne*. The first will undermine the Church, the last will blow it up. The Project of *Comprehension*, undertook by some of the best Clergy in England, must be call'd a *Monstrous*, and villainous Scheme of these Ecclesiastical *Achitophels*, to fill the Church with unhallow'd, Pagan Beasts (i.e. *Dissenters*) instead of *Christians*; but how favourably have these Gentlemen received, and how willing are they to give into, the famous Project of *Reconciliation with the Gallican Church*?

From which they think the Church of England parted but with a thin Veil: But, if it be true, that some French Clergymen, have a mind to meet us, I wish we had 'em in exchange for some of our *High-flying Clergy*; who are more than inclin'd to run over to them. And for this reason you may believe 'em, when they say they would rather be *Papists* than *Presbyterians*.

It's well known how they lament the lost Power of the Church, which they apprehend will never be retriev'd by a *Toleration*, or the *Hannover-Succession*; we see how they endeavour to advance their Authority, and to bully us, with their *Anathemas*; we know that some of 'em blasphemously repine at the want of the miraculous Power of the Church, in the first Century. How flourishing, say they, would be the State of the Church, how *Triumphant here upon Earth*, if we had once more the Power to send our Enemies quick down to *Hel*!

D

But

But God is so gracious to us, as not *now* to entrust these High-flying *Ambassadors* with such *full Powers*, considering, that he has given them at present too little Grace, Mercy and Charity to manage them. If *Sacheverell's* Loins were girt with this *Flaming-Sword*, he, who says, That *Princes should answer with the Sword, and the Church with Anathema's*; it wou'd be doubted whether he would look like an *Overseer sent by the Holy Ghost*, or rather like a *destroying Angel*. I'll pass by the scurrilous Language given to *Bishop Grindal*, and tell the Doctor one Secret, that if he had lived and so scandaliz'd the Hierarchy in *Haughty Laud's* Days, he would infallibly have gotten that *indelible Mark*, on both sides of his Head, which *Mr. Burton* had for the very same Crime, notwithstanding his *sacred Character*. Which ought to make the Doctor to forbear upbraiding the *Lords* with fear to punish, because their Mercy was so unparallel'd, as *almost* to forgive.

ARTICLE III.

AS to the Third Article, the Doctor justifies the Danger of the *Church*, and humbly opposes his single Opinion against the general Sense of the Queen, and the two Houses of Parliament, and maintains it to their Faces. But denies, that he design'd to blacken that *Vote of Parliament* which declared the Church to be out of Danger, by comparing it with the *Vote*, that declared *King Charles's Person out of Danger*; and wou'd avoid, that he intended to insinuate that the *Members of both Houses, who pass'd the said Vote, about the Safety of the Church, were then conspiring the Ruin of the Church*.

A Vote having pass'd in Parliament, declaring the *Church out of Danger*, the Doctor durst not arraign that *Vote* directly. And yet some way must be found to blacken it; and no way was thought so proper, as to compare it to that *Vote which declared King Charles out of Danger*; with this Addition of the Doctor's, only to make the Application, that *at the same time his Murderers were conspiring his Death*. This he knew would bring consequential Scandal upon it, and insinuate, what was not safe to affirm expressly; that the *Members of Parliament* were contriving the Ruin of the Church, when they *Voted* it.

out of *Danger*, because every Body knows, that the Parliament which made that Vote about King *Charles*, did conspire his Murder. But the Doctor says, that they who voted the King's Person out of *Danger*, were not the very same Persons who contrived his Murder, and therefore he cou'd not make the *Insinuation*. Tho' the Comparison should not exactly run upon *all four* when examined, yet the Doctor design'd to make that *Insinuation*, by giving just as much of the History as serv'd for that purpose, and if it should be true, that but a *Remnant*, or a few of that Parliament, which voted the King out of *Danger*, were the Contrivers of his Murder, yet still it will serve the Doctor's End by way of Comparison, for in Parliamentary Language it was still the same *House*, and differ'd no more, than a *thin House* from a *full one*, and therefore it was the same *House*, some Members only absent, that voted the King out of *Danger*, and conspired his Murder.

The great Design of the Sermon was to undermine the Queen's Title to the Crown, to asperse her Administration both in Spirituals and Temporals, and to traduce the late Parliament, and for each Article he has provided a *Parallel* by way of Illustration. To stigmatize the Church under the Government of the present Bishops, he says, *It is very obvious to draw a Parallel here, betwixt the sad Circumstances of the Church of Corinth formerly, and of the Church of England at present; and this is done without Discouragement, he is sure with Impunity by our pretended Friends and false Brethren; who the pretended Friends are, which ought to discourage, and are able to punish Schisms, except those false Brethren, the Bishops, I don't well know.*

To dishonour the last Parliament, he compares their Vote about the Church to the Vote of the *Rump-Parliament* about King *Charles's* Person.

At last alluding to the present Times, he thinks to come home to the Queen by a notable *Parallel*, when he says, *That tho' the Ways of Zion may mourn for a time, and her Gates be desolate, her Priests sigh, and she in Bitterness, because her Adversaries are Chief, and her Enemies AT PRESENT prosper, (At PRESENT foisted into the Text only to make the Application evident) this is the Lamentation of the Prophet, when Judah was gone in-*

to Captivity, the King in a foreign Country, and an Usurper upon the Throne. Can any Body think that this Gentleman had no *ill* Intention, tho' he swears it, or no Design at all, as his Managers say, in so many Reflections upon the Queen and Ministry, so artfully cover'd, and so methodically digested into Paralels?

To shew the *Danger of the Church*, the Doctor gives us this Character of the present Age, *For besides that Deluge of Prophaneness and Immorality, which overspread the whole Kingdom; besides the Variety of those Speech, p. 7. Schisms, Heterodox Opinions, and damnable Heresies, which are daily publish'd and propagated among us; I verily believe, that never were the Ministers of Christ so abused, and vilified, never was the Divine Authority of the Holy Scriptures so Arraign'd, and Ridiculed, never were Infidelity and Atheism so impudent and barefaced, never were such horrid Blasphemies printed in any Christian State, from the Foundation of Christianity to this Day.* So much of the Doctor's Speech I'll justify to be his own genuine Product; so elegantly he always declaims, so honestly he represents, so charitably he judges of his Neighbours, if a Stranger were to read this, he wou'd be apt to think, that there was ne'er a good Man in Great Britain besides the pious Doctor Sacheverell, so general is the *Deluge of Prophaneness*, that he must be the *Abraham* to intercede for us.

If our Neighbours believe this Man, they must gaze at us in Expectation of our immediate Destruction, as a People more abandon'd than ever *Sodom* was. If Posterity believes the execrable Report of this *Defamer*, they'll be ashamed of their Ancestors.

Are not we, even now, consider'd as a *Church*, the very Pride and Boast of the Reformation? Are not we, consider'd as a *People*, the honourable Head of the United Body of *Christendom*? Yet, Doctor Sacheverell says, there was never any such wicked *Christian State*, from the Foundation of Christianity to this Day.

Is not the Church (thus traduced by this *her Dutiful Son*) the main Strength and Bulwark against Popery? When was there greater Care or Piety shewn for propagating the Reform'd Religion, than at this Day? When were our Churches at Home better fill'd, or with a greater Appearance of real Devotion? When, or in what Church

Church of the World, were seen such large, liberal Charities, as are at this Day for educating poor Children in Religion and Virtue? And tho' Vice and Immorality has been always too prevailing, yet there never was a time so proper for the Doctor's purpose, to charge the Nation with it, as under the Queen's Administration.

Now the Managers have Recourse to the Doctor's *Godly Collections*, which they call Proofs of the general Corruption of the Nation, in Matters of Religion; and on that Head are brought the abortive Labours of that great *Billingsgate Logician*, *Edmund Hick*—, of that *Crack-brain'd Projector Afgill*, of that poor *Poet Gildon*, of that *Atheistical Vagabond Toland*, and of that Eminent Statesman *John Tuchin*, lately defunct.

Here the Doctor has learned of *Esq; Bickerstaff*, to engage with the dangerous Shadows of the Church's Enemies, chalk'd out upon the Wall: Are the Writings of these two or three insignificant Fellows, sufficient Grounds for an honest Man to charge a whole Nation with *Atheism* and *Infidelity*? But by the Doctor's Logick, all Men are Irreligious, because a few are so: But the Managers against the Doctor say, that all the Passages which are quoted in the *Collections*, to make out the present danger of the Church, prove no new danger of the Church, since the passing of that Vote, which was in 1705. because all those Books were wrote and printed long before 1705, and shew that the Administration has been so vigilant, that the Books and their Authors have been all censured and punish'd.

The good Bishop of *London* very justly prosecuted that abominable Brute *Hickeringhill*, to his damage of 20000*l.* if such a Fellow were to be believed. I am apt to think, if the Doctor had known *Hickeringhill's* Principles before that Prosecution, he would have spared him, as well as the rest of the Blaspheming *High flyers*; for *Hickeringhill* was once (in the Doctor's Sense) a true Son of the Church, as appear'd in that sawcy Dialogue he made, between *Capt. Edmund Hickeringhill*, Rector of *All Saints in Colchester*, and his Friend *Cornet Compton*, Bishop of *London*. *Afgill* has been punish'd both in *England* and *Ireland* for his Maggot, *Gildon* is more than half starved by several long Imprisonments, and *Mr. Blunt* has already accounted to God for his Errors. The *Observer* was prosecuted in *Westminster*

Westminster Hall, and escap'd the Pillory but by a Mistake of a Figure ; and if any Minister was then Lazy, I doubt it will fall upon the then Attorney-General.

The Rights of the Christian Church having expos'd the Principles of some of the Clergy, who are for setting up an Independency in the Church, has justly incurr'd their Displeasure ; and if the *House* had not burn'd the Book, for one unwary Passage, the *Universities*, who have had it long under their Consideration, were resolv'd to do it for the whole, as soon as they had answer'd it. I confess I never heard of the Anonymous Books in the *Collections*, and as I had forgot the others, I shou'd certainly never have known these, if the Doctor had not taken this Method to republish, and perpetuate 'em in the Record of the Trial.

If the Doctor had been sincere enough to have pointed to the real Danger of the Church, he shou'd not have forgot Mr. *Dodwell's* Book about the *Natural Mortality of the Soul*, &c. Which has shock'd the very Foundation of Christianity, he is a Gentleman of such extraordinary Learning, such a Philosopher, such an Historian, and so accurate in Polemical Divinity, that his Writings are of great Authority with the Learned themselves, and unquestioned by the Ignorant. How fatal then must an Atheistical Position prove ? When advanced, and defended with so much Plausibility, and so many seeming Arguments as that prodigious Man is furnished with. This is attended too, by another melancholly Circumstance, That neither the *Great South*, the Learned *Smalldridge*, nor the Divine Pen of *Atterbury*, who see so clearly the Church and her Sons in Danger ; have in the least enlighten'd, or assist'd us poor *Lay-folks*, against so dangerous a Prepossession. What can be the reason of this, but that the zealous Jacobite, atones for the dangerous Atheist ?

The same doubtless is the true Reason, why so many scandalous and obnoxious Passages in the Books of *Leslie*, *Hicks* and others, have escap'd the Censure of the Doctor's Collections : The Compilers of that extraordinary Piece, might almost in every Page of those Factionous Turbulent Writers, have found the most virulent Reflections on the whole Body of the Clergy : Taxing them with downright Atheism, and Infidelity, prostituting their

their Faith and Consciences for the Hopes of some Temporal Profit or Preferment, and giving up their Flocks and their own Souls to the Men in Power. In these Authors they might see the Supremacy of the Crown turn'd into Ridicule, and abus'd in the most opprobrious, villanous Terms: They might see the Reformation expos'd and traduc'd in Terms that even the Papists would blush to use, and all our first Reformers represented as a Pack of Mercenaries, who would sell the Church for Gold: And such advances made towards Popery, that even their own Missionaries durst not barefacedly make such forward Steps: But all this and much more is allow'd, nay approv'd, in Men so eminently serviceable to the Pretender.

Next to prove the *Danger of the State*, the Doctor produces some Passages out of the *Observator* and *Review*, which reflect upon the Queen, State, and Ministry. One of these Authors has been already pillory'd, and the other very narrowly mis'd it. And if the Queen and the Ministry were so happy as to have no other, or no more dangerous Enemies, than these two Authors, I wou'd venture to declare the Queen and Government out of Danger. But why was the famous *Application* forgot here, when the Doctor was collecting the dangerous Writings against the Queen and State. I fear the Doctor was too intimate with the Promoter of that Treasonable Remonstrance, against the *Queen's Power of Proroguing the Convocation*, which illegal Practices produced the severest Reprimand to the *Lower-House*, that ever came out of Her Majesty's most Gracious Mouth.

*Application of
the Lower-
House of Con-
vocation in
1707.*

Do not the Deductions drawn from the Book Entitled, *The Rights, &c. of the English Convocation*, tend to deprive the Queen of her Supremacy? Do not the other Writings of that Author, encourage the inferior Clergy to rebel against the Bishops their Superiors and Governors? And persuade the whole Body of the Clergy, to separate it self from its *supream Head*, by insinuating, that the Clergy is independent of the Temporal Power, to the manifest Invasion of the Queen's Ecclesiastical Prerogatives? The Queen, who is truly the *Nursing Mother* of the Church, seems to be sonder of her *Supremacy* than of any

any other Jewel in her Crown, it was with great Difficulties, that our Ancestors wrenched it out of the Hands of *ancient Popish* Clergy, to place it upon the Heads of our Kings, (as too bright for any other) nothing was able to fix it there, but making it Capital to deny it. And now some of our *Modern* Clergy are endeavouring sily to steal it back again, while others lay violent Hands upon it.

ARTICLE IV.

THE Managers at *Tom's* make out the first part of the fourth Article out of their own Words, pag. 15. Where you affirm, that there are *false Brethren in Church and State, who do weaken, and undermine, and betray in themselves, and encourage, and put it in the Power of our professed Enemies to overturn, and destroy the Constitution of both.* Then, that we may know whom you mean by these *False Brethren*, you explain your self in Page 22. That as to *false Brotherhood in regard to the World or State*, we may see *Men of Character, and Stations, shift and prevaricate with their Principles, start from their Religion upon any occasion of Difficulty, or Trial, and like the Disciples, flying from, and forsaking our Saviour when his Life lay at stake.* What can unwary Persons conclude from such Tergiversation, and Hypocrisy, but that all Religion is State-craft, and Imposture? To give still a higher Notion of these *False Brethren*, the *Men of Characters and Stations*, he advertises, pag. 18. Our Governors, of the *Falshood, and Treachery, as the Qualifications of those, who are entrusted with the Guardianship of our Church and State*, for fear Her Majesty's Lay-Ministers only shou'd seem to be implied in what he has already said, an After-thought in a Dedication was printed, to bespatter Her Majesty's Administration in Ecclesiastical, as well as Civil Affairs. For this purpose the Doctor says, That *our Constitution, i. e. Church and State, is so vigorously attacked from without, and so lazily defended from within.* Here the Managers against the Doctor want to be informed who are they, who in the Doctor's Opinion so vigorously attack the Church. I'll appeal to those who have conversed with the Party, whether they don't think the Miscarriage of the *Application*, to be the greatest Wound the Church ever received; whether they don't

call them *Enemies* to the Church, who have acquiesced under the Queen's Prerogative of Proroguing of the Convocation, and rail at those, who obstruct the Sitting of the *so long called for Convocation*. Who have own'd the Queen's Prerogative, or who are Judges of the Necessity of the Meeting of the Convocation, but the Queen's faithful Councillors, the Bishops? Who justly apprehend the ill Consequence of letting so many distemper'd Minds meet together, as may be found in that

Assembly, whom the Queen has already charged with a plain *Invasion of her Supremacy*, and branded with want of *Duty to her*, as well as to their Superiors. *Queen's Letter to the Convocation, 1707.*

If the Party will allow the Queen her Supremacy, she must be the only Defender of the Faith and Church; and as the Queen does nothing but by an Administration, and for that purpose the Bishops are the proper Ministers, I doubt it's too plain, that the Doctor takes their Lordships to be the *Lazy Defenders*. Then the Doctor goes on, and in Page 2. he says, that the Church is *not only to encounter the open Fury and Violence of her profess'd Enemies, but is to be betray'd and perfidiously given up by her own false hearted and insidious Apostles*. These Apostles of the Church, who were in the foregoing Page *vigorous Attackers* and *lazy Defenders*, are now become false-hearted and insidious Apostles; and a little forwarder he says, that *such is the hard fortune of the Church, her worst Adversaries must be let into her Bowels, under the holy Umbrage of Sons, who neither believe her Faith, own her Mission, submit to her Discipline, or comply with her Liturgy*. The Doctor bestows the Title of Son of the Church on none but himself, as *the dutiful Son of the Church*; and the Prelates, as *that false Son of the Church Bishop Grindal*.

I must recapitulate his Charge upon the Bishops, *the false Sons*, who vigorously *Attack* and lazily *Defend* the Church, her worst Adversaries, false hearted, and insidious Apostles, who neither believe her Faith, own her Mission, submit to her Discipline, or comply with her Liturgy. If our Hierarchy were so detestable as the Doctor has represented it, I should think the Church in the extreamest Peril; and if our Nation were so *universally corrupted*, there would be too much reason to apprehend God's Vengeance.

The Managers for the Doctor answer all this by telling you, that by those *Men of Characters and Stations*, the Doctor only meant *Church-wardens, Sidesmen, Constables*, and some Justices of the Peace, whose Civil Administration had given great Offence to the Doctor. I confess I knew not the Dignity, Authority and Power of those Magistrates, till I was inform'd by them, that Church-wardens and Sidesmen being entrusted with the Guardianship of the Church, have a Power in themselves to weaken and undermine it, and an opportunity to put in such False Sons as Bishop Grindal to betray it. A Constable's Office was never before now thought to be such a Station and Character, as that he, in himself cou'd, or was able to put it in the Power of our profess'd Enemies to overturn and destroy the Constitution and Establishment of either Church or State.

The Doctor himself apprehended this Turn to be ridiculous, and makes a more colourable Defence in his Speech; he argues very speciously, that a Man who has printed so many respectful Expressions, and paid so many Compliments to the Ministry, cannot be guilty of defaming them, and that nothing ought to be received in Evidence against such publick Demonstrations as he had given. 'Tis true, the Doctor did commend the *Happy Administration of the Government, and the refin'd Policies of the Parliament and Ministry*, in Page 23. of a Sermon printed in 1702. then we know the Doctor was pretty well pleased with the Queen, and entirely satisfy'd with the *refin'd Policies of the Ministry*. The Doctor is charged with defaming the Ministry in 1710, and he answers, that can't be, for I commended the Ministry in 1702. Upon this and other Passages some People don't stick to say, that notwithstanding the Doctor's Asseverations, the whole Speech is evasive and false, without one sincere tittle in it: And if the Doctor *has been made to speak* (as he complains, p. 5. of his Speech) *what he never thought of*, it was done by the Makers of his Speech, when they made him pray for the House of *Hannover*, and deny his Reflections upon the present Administration.

But the Doctor to purge himself fully takes a short Method; to prepare your Belief tells you of his Holy Mission from *GOD*, and his Commission from the *Holy Ghost*: Then lifting up his Eyes and Hands to Heaven, he appeals to the *dreadful Tribunal, at which He, and all the World*

a
m
ce
on
a
sta
fin
on
ma
but
kno
he l
a K
dian
they
agai
of y
Oat
bespa
their
canti
self t
Perfo

Th
Derby

N
and
down
Welf
Secre
with
of bo
gainst
is th
who
these
Th
sent,
Hono
Coura
Fortun
are

are to be Judged; called the Searcher of Hearts to witness, in the most Solemn and Religious manner, that he was Innocent of any Design to defame the Queen's Administration, or Ministry. This solemn Appeal to God, before such a Venerable Assembly, with so many Religious Circumstances, pronounc'd with so much Vehemence, and such sincere Behaviour of a Christian, works so strongly upon me, that my Charity has blinded my Senses, and makes me pray for his Soul's sake, That he spoke nothing but the Truth. Yet some Gentlemen, who pretend to know the Man, to know his Meaning, who affirm, that he has expressly named one Minister in Page 22. who have a Key to his Men of Character and Stations, his Guardians of the Church and Crown, desire to be excused, if they can't believe a Protestation, tho' never so Solemn, against a Matter of Fact. They say further, that some of your Managers were astonish'd, and trembled at the Oath, and have own'd that you were chiefly employ'd to bespatter the present Ministry, and some few finding their Party so strong, are now angry with you for recanting it; but you have infinitely recommended yourself to others by it, who think you now a most useful Person.

The latter part of the 4th Article is made out by the Derby Dedication.

' Now, when the Principles and Interests of our Church and Constitution, are so shamefully Betray'd and Run down, it can be no little Comfort to those who wish their Welfare and Security, to see, that notwithstanding the Secret Malice and Open Violence they are persecuted with, there are still to be found such Worthy Patrons of both, who dare Own and Defend them, as well against the Rude and Presumptuous Insults of the One side, as the Base undermining Treachery of the other; and who scorn to sit Silently by, and partake in the Sins of these associated Malignants.

' Tho' the Truth seems to be so much forsaken at present, yet, God be thank'd, They shall yet find, to our Honour, That we have still amongst Us those who have Courage to speak it, as well as those who have Lives and Fortunes to maintain it: And tho' the Age is sunk into

' the lowest Dreggs of Corruption, that it cannot endure
 ' sound Doctrine, there are not wanting some to Preach
 ' it, and others to Support it, at the Expence of Both:
 ' May the Influence of good Examples, which as much
 ' animates our Friends as it terrifies our Enemies, be as dif-
 ' fusively prevailing as 'tis nobly conspicuous, and the
 ' Blessing of that Church attend you, which you so emi-
 ' nently adorn and sustain.

Here we are told from the Pulpit, That the Principles
 of our Church and Constitution are shamefully betray'd and
 run down with secret Malice, and open Violence. Is not
 this to instil Fears and Jealousies into weak Minds, and to
 make each Man suspect the other of Secret Designs?
 And are not these Fears and Jealousies groundless? When
 our Church is in a most Flourishing Condition, and the
 Constitution of our State strengthen'd by so many good
 Laws, and our good Queen ready to give what more we
 desire.

When he says there are some who scorn to sit Silently by,
 and partake in the Sins of these associated Malignants, does
 he not knavishly divide the People by the Distinction of
 Malignants? and does he not tell us in his Sermon, who
 those Church-devouring Malignants are? And does he not
 immediately threaten those associated Malignants? And
 tell 'em, that they shall find, to our Honour, that we have
 still among Us, those who have Courage to speak it, as well
 as those who have Lives and Fortunes to maintain it. Does
 he not here blow the Trumpet? Does he not here muster
 his Forces? Does he not here inform us how resolute
 some are to maintain it with their Lives, and how able
 others are to support it with their Fortunes? Here he ex-
 cites and stirs them up to Arms: Here he directs them to
 the Enemy, by pointing out to the associated Malignants
 and at last very Piously gives 'em the Blessing of the Church
 to attend them in the good Enterprize.

These godly Exhortations have had the design'd Success
 and open Rebellion has been the immediate Consequence
 but the Doctor again professes in the Presence of God
 That it was without any Fault of his, or the least En-
 ragement given by him. This seems to some People to be
 another rash Oath, who say, that the Sermon influenced
 and the Doctor's indiscreet Behaviour afterwards en-

rag'd the Mob; but his Managers say in his behalf, that when the Gentry of White-Fryars attended him at his Chambers, and were so respectful to pull off their Caps to him, he could not be so rude as not to bow to 'em: That he could not refuse the Compliment of his Solicitor, Bail, Council and Friends, to attend him with their Equipages, before and behind, like Guards, to the Hall; and who could prevent his ungovernable Footmen from hollowing themselves, and making the Mob do so too: He never thought this would give the least Encouragement; it was but Christian-like, to desire the Prayers of the Church when under Persecution; and but Politick, to lay the Persecution upon the Dissenters.

The Doctor himself, (as well as the rest of the World) thinks that the Charge of wickedly wresting divers Texts of Scripture, lies very hard upon him, as a Christian and a Minister of Christ: Yet, he seems to me to stand very easy under it; when to clear his Holy Character of so foul a Blot, which he Speech, p. 21. apprehends, if he were even acquitted, must leave a Scar upon his good Name; when, to support an Opinion of his Integrity, whose whole Capacity of doing good in the World, (he says) principally depends upon it; not one word has been suggested in his Defence or Excuse, but he again appeals to another Tribunal to be judged by, when the Sun is not plainer at Noon-Day, than several Perversions of Scripture in his Sermon. But, he hopes, indeed, that those, whose particular Profession, and Studies qualify 'em to be the most Competent Judges of such Matters, will absolve him in this Particular. If by being absolved, the Doctor should mean, to be acquitted of wresting the Scriptures, I believe the most Competent Judges will not absolve him; but if by Absolving, he means only Forgiving, he need not fear but that, whether he Perverts or Blasphemes the Scriptures, whether his Appeals to God be true or false, for any Wickedness he has done, or shall do, nay, if he were capable of Assassination, he may be fully absolved, whilst such good Confessors as Cook, Snat, and Collier are living.

I have not yet heard any of his Managers deny his corrupting the Scriptures; none yet, but himself, have arriv'd to that invincible Impudence, it will soon appear by the excellent Speech of one of the Manages, how he

he Abuses them sometimes by adding, sometimes by leaving out Words and Sentences; sometimes he mis-cites Passages of Holy Writ, and always wickedly mis-applies them. What an infinite Scandal is this Man to the Church, who, (unlike a Christian Priest, pronouncing the immutable and plain Truths of the Gospel) resembles the Heathen Juglers, making their Idols speak their own Sense, adapting their Oracles to all Occasions, and explaining of 'em to all Purposes? How steadfast was the Wickedness? How Atheistical the Presumption, to appeal to God for the Truth thereof, when he ought to have humbled himself before God for the *Flagrancy* of the Sin?

Let us consider this Man, who says he is *satisfied of the Queen's being an Affectionate Nursing Mother to the Church*, yet represents her, as an unnatural *Step-Mother*, who has committed the *Guardianship* to such lazy *Defenders*, and put her *professed Enemies* into her *Bowels*.

This is the Loyal and Faithful Subject, who would die for his Queen, and in Defence of her Title, who affirms to her Face, that the Means used to secure her Succession to the Crown, were *odious and unjustifiable*. This is the Asserter of her Prerogatives, who said, *That the Church Groan'd under the Prerogative Act, and Letter Missive*, i. e. Her Supremacy.

This Man doubtless must be in earnest, when he commends Her Majesty's Happy and Wise Administration, and the Vigilance of the Ministry, yet, after that he has made the Nation the very Sink of Perdition, he says, *That all these Mischiefs walk up and down this Distracted Kingdom with Impunity*.

If some Persons, through a real Sense of Religion, should apprehend any Danger of the Church, by reason of Vice and Immorality, inseparable at all times, from all Nations under Heaven, always complain'd of, and never more than *now* discouraged: Yet the Queen has just reason to think it *very injurious to her*, to take a Pretence from thence to insinuate that the Church is in any Danger from her Administration, and has as much reason to resent the Indignity,

dignity, and suspect the Design, as her Grandfather, the blessed Martyr had, upon the very same Occasion. 'For, 'says he, when they did observe, that many *Honest* and 'Religious Minds in that House, did complain of those 'Dangers that did threaten the Church; they likewise 'took the same word in their 'Mouth, and their Cry was, *Templum Domini, Templum Domini,* 'when the true Care of the Church 'never came into their Hearts; and what the one did out 'of Zeal to Religion, the other took as a plausible *Theam* 'to deprave our Government; as if we, our Clergy, and 'Council, were either senseless, or careless of Religion; and 'this wicked Practice hath been, to make us seem to walk 'before our People, as if we halted before God.

Rushworth, Vol. 1.

Appendix, f. 6.

This Man must not be thought to intend to asperse the Memory of the late King, whose Government, he says, was blown up by the Providence of God, and who had ruin'd the Church, had not an opportune Providence interposed, i. e. His Death.

Low-Church-Man,

p. 4. and 16.

This Man prays as heartily, (as he swears) for the *Harmoner* Succession, but even there, he won't acknowledge their Right to the Succession. So high he is for the uninterrupted Succession; so firmly he adheres to the Hereditary, as the only Right; and still supposes a Parliamentary Right to be the Title of the Mob.

He professes not to have the least Dislike of the Indulgence granted by Law to the Dissenters, and says, he has declared his Ap- probation in the most express Words

Speech, p. 8.

imaginable, viz. 'Queen Elizabeth, like a Queen of true

'Resolution, and pious Zeal, pronounc'd, that such were the 'restless Spirits of that factious People,

'that no Quiet was to be expected from them, till they were utterly sup-

'press'd; which, like a prudent Princess, she did by whole-

'some Severities, that the Crown for many Years sat easie,

'and flourishing upon her Head; and had her Successor,

'King James but followed her wise Politicks, &c. In his

Sermon he commends the wholesome Severities used to-

wards 'em by Queen Elizabeth, wishes that her Suc-

cessors had followed her wise Politicks; and yet he'll

take

take it amiss, if we doubt his Sincerity, when in his Speech he desires to be believ'd, that he approve of the Indulgence now granted to them, who extols Queen *Elizabeth* for having *totally suppress'd* 'em.

This Man, who in his other Writings continually demands the *Execution of the Penal Laws, as in Queen Elizabeth's Time*; and in the mean time admonishes our *Superior Pastors to do their Duty in Thundering out their Anathema's*; to damn their Souls (which he still affirms they can, and ought to do) since their Goods and Persons are protected by the Law, will think it hard, to be thought, *to betray any want of Christian Moderation.*

I hope yet, that we all mean the same thing, tho' we express our selves differently about it, that we still wish the same thing; tho' we shew the contrary Passions of Joy and Sorrow upon the same occasion. I hope we are all going the same way, tho' some of us look backward. That, tho' we seem to have different Designs in working up the Plot, yet in the end they will all tend to bring about one Glorious Action; and that there is no other, but a *laudable Contention among us, who shall exceed the other in contributing to advance the Queen's present Happiness, and secure the Protestant Succession.* Yet I would desire one side to satisfy the other of their Sincerity, by desisting, to give out, that they are encourag'd by the Queen, (to do I don't know what,) by forbearing to libel the other side, under the Umbrage of (so unacceptably) addressing Her Majesty; and by those Addresses to insinuate that the Queen wants Encouragement from them; by ceasing again to traduce Her Majesty, as if she had a Secret Will, different from Her Declarations; and at last by granting Her Majesty, Her most ardent Wish, in uniting the Minds of her People.

There are some, no doubt, who wou'd repeal the *Toleration*, and dissolve the Union; who endeavour to defeat the *Hamover Succession*, and to unsettle the *Revolution*. They know well enough what Obedience is paid, even by this *abandon'd People*, to the Word of God, and what Influence the Clergy have, even when they pervert it. This very Method was taken formerly by the *Great Earl of Warwick*; he employ'd a very *Significant Tool*, that *Ecclesiastical Incendiary*, and predicant Herauld, Doctor *Goddard*, who proclaim'd at *St. Paul's* too, the *Divine*

Right

Right of Henry the Sixth, set forth the Injuries done him; condemn'd the Resistance made against him, arraign'd the Parliamentary Title, and Recognition of the undoubted Right of the House of York; from hence the People concluded Edward the IV. to be an Usurper, immediately the London Mob took Arms, and deposed the Lawful Prince; and at that time 'twas the Priest, and not the Earl, who was the King-maker.

To prevent any such execrable Attempt, let some great Genius Project a Monumental Act; let the Preamble rehearse, how London and the whole Kingdom have escap'd a second Fire, by professed and disguised Papists: Let the Church, if possible, be settled in a more Flourishing and Safe Condition; let the Profession be still more encourag'd, and the Professors be made more worthy; let the Obedience of the Inferior Clergy, be bound to the Superior; let the Supremacy be secured to the Crown, and the Dependency to the State; and let some effectual Remedy be provident against Applicationers and Occasional Abjurors: Let the Crown be adorn'd with all its sparkling Prerogatives; let it cast such a Lustre as may make it look amiable, but not terrible: For the obtaining the Queen's Wish, for the uniting the Minds of Her Subjects; and for the fulfilling Her Promise, let the Toleration be establish'd.

Let the Act of Union, and the Hannover Succession be made Irreverfible; let the Revolution be declared honourable; let the necessary Means, the Resistance then made, and in such deplorable Cases hereafter to be made, be allowed lawful and justifiable.

Let the Memory of our Deliverers, King William and Mary, be inshrin'd in Glory: Then, let the Felicities of Queen ANNE be recorded, to amaze Posterity; and let Her Virtues be repeated, for their Example: Let Her Zeal for the Church, Her Benefactions to its Ministers, Her Wise Choice of its Guardians; Her Love for Her People, and their Duty to Her, be perpetuated. At last, let a most Ardent Prayer be framed, (equal if possible to our Wishes) for the longest Continuance of her precious Life, and for the invaluable Blessing of an Heir of her Body; and to ratify this Decree, it shall Thunder and Lighten from on high, and the Voice of God, as it were, shall be heard in the Universal Joy, and Acclamations of the People, Amen, and Amen.

APPENDIX

STATE TRACTS, Vol. I. p. 539, 540.

The great Charter of King John

‘ AND whereas we have granted all these things for God’s sake, and for the Amendment of our Government, and for the better comprising the Discord arisen betwixt Us and our Barons: We, willing that the same be firmly held and establish’d for ever, do make and grant to our Barons the Security underwritten; to wit, That the Barons shall chuse Five and Twenty Barons of the Realm, whom they list, who shall to their utmost Power keep and hold, and cause to be kept the Peace and Liberties which we have granted and confirmed by this our present Charter; insomuch, that if We, or our Justice, or our Bayliff, or any of our Ministers, act contrary to the same in any thing, against any Persons, or offend against any Article of this Peace and Security, and such our Miscarriage be shown to four Barons of the said Five and Twenty, those four Barons shall come to Us, or to our Justice, if we be out of the Realm, and shew Us our Miscarriages, and require Us to amend the same without delay; and if we do not amend it, or if we be out of the Realm, our Justice do not amend it within forty Days after the same is shown to Us, or to our Justice if we out of the Realm, *Then the said four Barons shall report the same to the Residue of the said Five and Twenty Barons, and then those Five and Twenty Barons, with the Commonalty of all England, may distress Us by all the ways they can; to wit, by seizing on our Castles, Lands and Possessions, and by what other means they can, till it be amended, as they shall adjudge; saving our own Person, the Person of our Queen, and the Persons of our Children; and when it is amended, they shall be subject to Us as before; and whoever of the Realms will, may swear, that for the Performance of these things he will obey the Commands of the said five and twenty Barons, and that together with them he will distress Us to his Power: And*

we give publick and free leave to swear to all that will swear, and will never hinder any one: And for all Persons of the Realm, that of their own accord will swear to the said Five and Twenty Barons to distress Us, We will issue our Precept, commanding them to swear as aforesaid.

REFLECTIONS on a late Pamphlet, entitled, Priest- craft in Perfection.

— *Antiquam exquirite Matrem.*

THE Author of a late Pamphlet, entitled, *Priestcraft in Perfection*, has taken a great deal of Pains to prove, that the Clause of the *Churches Power* was not contained in the *imprinted Book of Articles* that was established by Law; which in my Opinion was not absolutely necessary to his Purpose: For upon a strict Survey of the Words of the Act of Parliament, and calling to mind some Passages I had met with in Books, I find that none of the Articles contained in that *imprinted Book* were confirmed by Law, except those Articles which only concern the Confession of the true Christian Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments; and that the Articles contained in the said *imprinted Book* which relate to Discipline, and to such Doctrines as concern not the Essence of the Christian Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments, were not passed by the Parliament. And therefore that Author might have inferred, that the Clause of the *Churches Power* could not be confirmed by Law, tho' it was contained in the *imprinted Book* ratify'd by Parliament, because that Clause relates only to Discipline. I wonder that a Gentleman so willing to destroy the Credit of Church-Authority, should over-look this Consideration, when it tended not only to serve his Purpose of proving, That the Clause of the *Churches Power* was not Established by Law; but to take off from the Legal Authority

thority of so many other Articles of the Church, which are now universally thought to be Established by Law. But few Mens Acuteness is equal to their Zeal ; and therefore our Author has, throughout his Book, suppos'd, *That all the Articles, contained in the imprinted Book, referred to by the Act of Parliament, are establish'd by Law.* But to carry on the Matter further than he has done, I shall produce the very words of the Law, and then confirm the Sense I shall give of it by some undeniable Authorities. The Articles

confirmed by Law are, *All the Articles of Religion, which ONLY concern the Confession of the True Christian Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments, comprised in a Book imprinted, intitl'd,* Articles whereupon it was agreed by the Archbishops, and Bishops, and the whole Clergy, in the Convocation holden at London, in the Year of our Lord God, 1562, &c. Which Words plainly confirm only those Articles comprised in the imprinted Book, which can be reduced to these two Heads, viz. *Articles that concern only the Confession of the true Christian Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments ;* and exclude all other Articles which fall not under those two Heads.

This seems to me to be the obvious Sense of the Words of the Law ; and if the Reader will but consider, when he reflects on the words, That in *Q. Elizabeth's* time Matters of Discipline and Ceremony were esteemed of high Consequence, and disputed of with great Vehemence among the Protestants of *England* ; and I may add, with a Zeal equal to that which we see at this day in relation to *Passive-Obedience* ; it is impossible to imagine, that the Parliament would not have mention'd Articles of Discipline, (which ran so much in their Heads) as well as Articles that concerned only the Confession of the true Christian Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments ; unless they had excluded all the Articles that related to Discipline. And the same may be said in regard to other Doctrines contained in the *Thirty Nine Articles*, which fell not under the two Heads mentioned in the Act of Parliament.

I do not expect that the Sense I have given of the Law (how just soever it is) should of it self convince Men who are already strongly engaged in the common Opinion. But when they come to consider what I have further to say, and join what I have already said with it, I am not

with-

without Hopes of convincing all unprejudiced Men, that I have given the true Sense of the Law.

1. In the first place, I shall produce the Authority of that great Lawyer Mr. *Selden*.

He tells us, ' There is a Secret concerning the Articles : Of late Ministers have subscribed to all of them, but by Act of Parliament that confirmed them, they ought only to subscribe to those Articles which contain Matter of Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments, as appears by the first Subscriptions. But Bishop *Bancroft* (in the Convocation held in King *James's* Days) he began it, that Ministers should subscribe to three things, to the King's Supremacy, to the Common-Prayer, and to the Thirty Nine Articles ; many of them do not contain matter of Faith. Is it matter of Faith how the Church should be governed ? Whether Infants should be baptized ? Whether we have any Property in our Goods, &c.

The Table under the Head Articles.

These words not only declare Mr. *Selden's* Opinion of the meaning of the Law, but make him testify a matter of Fact that confirms his Opinion, and puts the Truth of his Opinion beyond all doubt : For if the *first Subscriptions* were only to such parts of the Thirty nine Articles as contain only matter of Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments, it must be because the Law was at first understood to relate only to such of the Thirty Nine Articles as come under one of those Heads.

Whether the Fact be true or no that Mr. *Selden* relates, may I suppose at this day be put out of all question ; for I doubt not but there are Places where the first Subscriptions of the Clergy to the Articles are kept. I am not skilful enough in Ecclesiastical Matters to say *where* ; but wherever they are, I do, upon the Opinion I have of Mr. *Selden's* great Integrity, appeal to those Subscriptions for the Truth of what Mr. *Selden* affirms.

2. But besides the Authority of Mr. *Selden* as a Lawyer, and a Witness of a Matter of Fact, whereby it appears that the Parliament did confirm only some of the Thirty nine Articles, I will present the Reader with a Passage that I find among the *Journals of Parliament*, published by Sir *Simon D'Ewes*, in a Speech of *Peter Wentworth*, Esq; one of the Burgeses for the Borough of *Tregony* in *Cornwall*, made

made in the Parliament of 1575. wherein, among abundance of other things worthy of Remark, 'tis affirm'd by him, p. 239. ' That he had heard of old Parliament-Men, ' that the Banishment of the Pope and Popery, and the restoring of true Religion, had their beginning from this ' House, and not from the Bishops; and he had heard ' that few Laws for Religion had their Foundation from ' them. —I was, *says he*, amongst others the last Parliament sent to the Bishop of *Canterbury* for the Articles of Religion that then pass'd this House. He ask'd us, why we did put out of the Book the Articles for the Homilies, Consecrating of Bishops, and such-like? Surely Sir, said I, because we were so occupy'd in other Matters, that we had no time to examine them, how they agreed with the Word of God. What, said he, surely you mistook the Matter; you will refer yourselves wholly to us therein? No, by the Faith I bear to God, said I, we will pass nothing before we understand what it is; for that were but to make you Popes: Make you Popes who list, said I, for we will make you none. And sure, Mr. Speaker, the Speech seem'd to me to be a Pope-like Speech; and I fear lest our Bishops do attribute this of the Pope's Canons to themselves (*Papa non potest errare*;) for surely if they did not, they would reform things amiss, and not spurn against God's People for writing as they do.

i. These words of Mr. *Wentworth* are a plain Evidence of the Matter of Fact, *That the Parliament put out, or did not confirm, several of the 39 Articles.* For this Speech was deliver'd in Parliament in 1575. about five Years after the Parliament established the Articles; and therefore it is not to be imagined that Mr. *Wentworth* should have affirmed, that any *Articles were put out by the House*, unless they really were put out; when there must of course have been so many Members of Parliament present, who were Members in 1575. (when the Articles were establish'd) able to contradict him; had not what he said been true.

Besides, Mr. *Wentworth* was stop'd in the Progress of this Speech for his great Boldness, and afterwards examin'd before a Committee of the House (to whom he gave it in Writing) on the account of some Exceptions taken to some Passages which he had deliver'd; but not

notice was taken of this Particular, as appears from his *Examination*, printed immediately after his Speech, in the *Journal* of Sir *Simon D'Ewes*; and consequently it is reasonable to imagine, that the *Committee* was conscious that what he delivered in that Particular, was true.

2. The Words of Mr. *Wentworth* are not only an Evidence of the Matter of Fact, that the House of Commons put out, or did not confirm several Articles contained in the *Imprinted Book of Articles*; but do so fall in with the Expressions of the *Act of Parliament*, as to leave no reasonable Doubt but that the Parliament passed not several Articles contain'd in the *Imprinted Book*.

For the Articles put out, according to Mr. *Wentworth*, were, the *Article for the Homilies*, the *Article for Consecrating Bishops*, and such like; which is as much as to say, Articles relating to such Doctrines as were not Fundamentals, or of the Essence of Christian Faith, and Articles relating to Discipline. To which Heads, if you add these two mention'd in the *Act of Parliament*, viz. *Articles that only concern the Confession of the true Christian Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments*, you have all the Heads under which Matters of Divinity are usually rank'd. So that the Words of the *Act of Parliament*, and of Mr. *Wentworth*, are like Tallies to one another. Wherefore I think I may conclude, *That several of the Thirty Nine Articles were not confirm'd by the Parliament*. For since the Words of the Law have so plain a relation to the Distinction of Articles into different Kinds, and since a Distinction of Articles into different Kinds is confirm'd by Matter of Fact, and since that Distinction is a common Distinction in Divinity, I think the Words of the *Act of Parliament* ought to be understood conformably to it. For why should any one suppose the Parliament expressed themselves unaccurately, and that they meant all the *Articles comprized in the Imprinted Book*, when they speak of those only which concern the *Confession of the true Christian Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments*, comprized in that *Imprinted Book*: while taking the Words in the obvious Sense, and in the Sense agreeable to Matter of Fact, and the Nature of things, makes 'em use the most accurate Expression in the World?

How many of our *Thirty Nine Articles* are struck out from being established by Law by the foregoing Comment

ment on the Law, cannot be known with that Certainty as if we had the *Imprinted Book of Articles* recorded, as our other Laws are. Then perhaps we should have seen what Articles were confirm'd, and what were not confirm'd. But since we are deprived of that Light about Religious Matters establish'd by Law, that we have in Civil Matters establish'd by Law, we have no other way to find the *Articles* establish'd by Law, but by running over the whole 39 Articles, and considering the Nature of them. This I do not propose at present to take upon me; but only beg leave to observe, That we may be sure we have no Homilies by Law establish'd. For the *Homilies* are no otherwise supposed to be establish'd by Law, than as they are a part of the Thirty Nine Articles; the 35th whereof affirms them to contain a godly and wholesome Doctrine, and necessary for these Times. And Mr. Wentworth directly says, *The Article for the Homilies was put out by the House.* Tho' had he not mention'd that Article, the Matter would have otherwise been very plain. For how can an Article, which affirms, *That 33 Sermons or Homilies do contain a godly and wholesome Doctrine, and necessary for these Times,* be one of the Articles of Religion which only concern the Confession of the true Christian Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments? The Articles which only concern the Confession of the Christian Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments are no more concern'd whether there should be any Homilies, or whether these Sermons or Homilies contain a godly and wholesome Doctrine, and necessary for these Times, than they are concern'd in the numerous Sermons and Books, cited by Sacheverell's Council in behalf of Passive Obedience.

What I have said, is, I hope, sufficient to carry the Point further than the Author of *Priestcraft in Perfection* has done, who has argued on the Supposition, that *all the Thirty Nine Articles are establish'd by Law*; and to convince any Man that is more concern'd for Truth than his own Opinion, not only that the Clause of the *Church's Power*, in the beginning of the 20th Article, is not confirm'd by Law, but that *there are several of the Thirty Nine Articles not confirm'd by Law.*

FINIS.

3
s
n
t
t
o
r
n.
ut
ve
no
ey
of
nd
ys,
no
ld
le,
n a
nes,
the
the
tel
Sa
be
con
hef
ons
Paf
oint
has
hir
ince
own
wer,
by
Arti